REMARKS

This Amendment response to the Office Action of March 25, 2005. Claims 1-10 are pending in the application.

Rejections under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph.

On page 2 of the office action, the examiner rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph. These claims have been amended to alleviate these rejections. Reconsideration of these claims on this ground is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 USC § 102

Beginning on page 2, the examiner rejected claims 1-10 under 35USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Giese et. al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,728,267). These rejections are respectively traversed on the ground that Giese does not teach or suggest each element of the claims.

Referring specifically to independent claim 1, elements (2) and (3), these elements recite "receiving, after said step (1), a subscriber context referencing polices that describe applications and services available to said subscriber; (3) comparing said application or service requested by said packet with polices referenced by said subscriber context to identify matching policies..." (emphasis added) As indicated by page 7 of the specification, "a subscriber context...identifies the services or applications available to that subscriber, by referencing each of the policies required to provide a service or application." The policies, themselves, detail "the specific actions or treatments required to provide a service or application." Thus, these policies are provided so that the system will have a repository to turn to for determining, e.g., whether a subscriber is authorized to receive certain information, and to do so without the need to continually and dynamically seek permissions and

authorizations from the system.

Giese, on the other hand, does not retrieve "a subscriber context referencing policies" as indicated above, and instead must dynamically interact with a system to obtain the needed information regarding an application that has been requested. This can be seen from figures 19A, B and C. Thus, it is submitted that those portions of the Giese reference cited by the Examiner in the context of elements (2) and (3) of claim 1 do not teach or suggest those elements (nor does any other portion of Giese teach or suggest those elements).

Further, as indicated by element (2), this element will not be initiated until a packet is received, per element (1). This is different from Geise, which instead requires a set of primitives to be invoked, per column 8, line 59-64.

For at least the reasons set-forth above, it is submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the art of record. In addition, it is submitted that claim 3 as amended is allowable over the art of record, as it also recites "obtaining a subscriber context referencing polices that references applications or services..." The remaining claims (depending from independent claims 1 or 3) are also allowable for at least the reasons set-forth above. Reconsideration of these claims is respectfully requested.

Please charge any additional fees due in connection with this matter, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0219.

If there are any questions, please call the undersigned at the telephone number

indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP

Scott M. Alter
Registration No. 32,879

1600 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, Va. 22102
TEL   703-251-9710
FAX   703-251-9797
Date: _____9/23/05_____